Specific, clear departmental statements about promotion and tenure procedures and criteria are essential to a successful faculty rewards system. The departmental document should identify departmental priorities and demonstrate how they are aligned with the faculty reward system, spell out procedures in detail, articulate the unique characteristics of each discipline, and describe how scholarship is defined in the field. It can provide new faculty with an understanding of what is important and how the priorities of the department support the mission of the institution. It is also this document that should provide clear and essential guidelines to those who serve on the departmental promotion and tenure committee and to faculty who are preparing for promotion and tenure review. In addition, it is this statement that is the basis upon which other committees, deans, provosts, and administrators must rely as they review the recommendations that are being made. Unfortunately, the departmental documents are often too general, too hastily wrought, or downright nonexistent.

A report issued by the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards at the University of Memphis (1995) stresses the centrality of the department’s role in the promotion and tenure process.

Accountability begins at the departmental level with clearly defined standards for evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion. Specific guidelines should be developed at the departmental level, reviewed by a college-level faculty advisory committee to the dean, and approved by the dean and the provost. These guidelines are critical to an effective tenure and promotion process. The guidelines should be distributed to each faculty member at the time he/she joins the faculty, at the time of midterm review, and at the time he/she applies for tenure or promotion. The guidelines should be discipline-specific, although in harmony with general university guidelines. Written guidelines containing the specific criteria and procedures for faculty evaluations should be updated as needed. Departmental standards should be included in the tenure and promotion materials sent forward from the department to the college and university levels on the behalf of the candidate.

At the heart of this process is the need for all departments to (1) spell out specific requirements for tenure and promotion; (2) inform faculty yearly as to their progress; and (3) communicate these criteria to the college committees, deans, and the provost.

In addition to the development and distribution of specific standards, departments are also urged to assist new, nontenured faculty through the use of a mentor system. The use of mentors to aid in faculty development is of crucial importance.
While a growing number of quality departmental documents are being developed, many existing statements do not support or facilitate a quality decision-making process. Joan North, dean of the College of Professional Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, spoke for many of her colleagues at the 1998 National Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards when she reported circumstances that exist in far too many instances:

- The information forwarded with a recommendation is neither clear nor concise. There is often a reluctance by the department to identify poor performance—often from a genuine compassion for less stellar colleagues. In addition, some departments fear legal ramifications from negative decisions or find genuinely and irreconcilably differing views on what defines quality.

- The candidate has no voice, letting the evidence speak for itself or relying on the department to interpret the evidence. Essential information is thus missing.

- The dean must spend considerable time probing through extensive materials to identify where problems exist—problems in either quality of the candidate or in the process itself.

When a department ignores evidence of poor performance, waiting to see if the dean catches it, the department in fact relinquishes its power, its ability to define its own quality and be in charge of its own future, three roles that most faculty in that department would rather maintain. When guidelines are poor, when candidates, committees, deans, and the provost are left to struggle as best they can through the process, everyone—and the institution itself—suffers. The clearer the document, the more closely it meshes with the priorities of the institution; the more sensitive it is to the departmental context, the discipline it represents, and the range of faculty work that is required for a department to reach its full potential; and the fairer the system will be.

**STARTING THE PROCESS**

Work does not usually begin on the development of a new or revised departmental promotion and tenure document without a formal request from the dean or chief academic officer. As with every other instance, the clearer and more detailed this charge is, the more efficient the process will be, and the greater the likelihood that the document itself will be substantially better as well as more compatible with those developed by other departments.
EXAMPLE: SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

The following are sections from the charge given to the departments within the Maxwell School at Syracuse University by its dean, John Palmer.

The general goal of improving the quality of our undergraduate education and teaching has been an explicit priority of the Maxwell School since 1988–89. To this end, the goals outlined below have been agreed upon by the dean and department chairs. Unless otherwise noted, the specific initiatives either have been implemented school wide or have been adopted by some departments and are in process in others. They also will be a continuing focus of biweekly meetings of the dean and department chairs throughout this year.

1) Improve Faculty Teaching Effectiveness

   a) Develop departmental policy statements on what is expected/required and the role that teaching will play in various reward systems.

   b) Undertake student evaluations of all courses.

   c) Have complete, informative syllabi for all courses on record in department files before the beginning of semester and passed out in the first class.

   d) Institute annual peer review and feedback for all nontenured faculty, along with the assignment of senior faculty as teaching mentors, and the development of teaching portfolios for the tenure review process.

   e) Institute systematic (but less frequent) peer review for all tenured faculty, and develop teaching portfolios for the promotion review process.

2) Deploy Faculty Teaching Resources More Effectively

   a) Implement a policy of greater teaching and advising responsibilities (and recognition of same in the various reward systems) for less active scholars.

   Approximately one month after this charge was given, James Follain, then chair of the economics department, was asked what factors were considered as his unit began to address the issue of the importance of teaching and the faculty reward system. These were his observations at that time:

1) Why We Moved Aggressively

   • Leadership of the university and the Maxwell School made it clear this was a high priority.
• We believe we do a good job in the classroom; a formal system that documents this can only help.

• We believe those departments that exhibit responsiveness to important university objectives are likely to be successful in requests for support.

• We believe in accountability and incentives, as long as they are approved by the department.

• We believe we know something about incentives and were anxious to do something constructive.

2) Stylized Facts We Faced

• The market emphasizes scholarly output.

• Successful teaching benefits from an ongoing and active research agenda.

• A tuition-driven university such as this cannot and should not ignore its primary “client”: the student.

• The correlation between good teaching and research is high, though not perfect.

• We have a tradition of playing hardball at the time of salary review.

• Our department has a long and successful tradition of requiring student evaluations of teaching.

This implies that good teaching is an essential part of our jobs; however, teaching performance alone cannot be the sole nor even the dominant determinant of salary or merit raises. It also suggests that our department would be receptive to a plan that would evaluate teaching.

3) Development of a Plan to Evaluate Teaching

• Develop a teaching evaluation document similar to our research evaluation report.

• Work with a teaching evaluation committee, which consists of three experienced and good teachers.

• Read education literature on the subject, which tended to confirm our own views. This is probably similar to the opinions of noneconomists who study the works of economists on the economy!

• Developing a good process or document is very hard.
4) **Process to Evaluate Teaching: Key Points**

- Devote attention to outliers (the exceptional in the group).
- Those deemed as excellent should be rewarded.
- Those deemed as below the norm required will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- Consider quantity versus quality.
- Student evaluations are important.
- Portfolios and peer reviews also matter.

5) **Costs and Benefits of the Process, and Exercises to Develop One**

**Costs**
- Time-consuming, especially up front.
- Nontenured people will take teaching more seriously. Time will tell whether this matters at tenure time.

**Benefits**
- Destroys the myth that teaching does not matter.
- Excellence is rewarded.
- Poor performers are to be held accountable.
- Discussions of teaching performances are common.
- Improves the image of our department.

As these comments so clearly indicate, the development of these policy statements must take place within the context of the mission of the institution, the priorities of the school or college in which the department exists, and the discipline.

**EXAMPLE: UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS**

At the University of North Texas, the dean of the college of arts and sciences, Nora Bell (now president of Wesleyan College in Georgia), took a somewhat different approach by asking her chairs to respond to a series of carefully constructed questions. Notice how carefully the promotion and tenure issues have been placed in the context of the mission of the institution and the priorities and strengths of the unit.
It will be the responsibility of the chair to oversee the development of the departmental statement to inform all new appointees of its existence and what is called for and to insure that the guidelines that are developed are followed. Those that play an active role in the drafting of the document must keep in mind that there are four distinct areas in which these policy statements are used.

In developing the faculty reward system statement, the department is, in effect, establishing its major policy document. Since the system cannot be in place without addressing the issues of priorities, mission, and resources, the very process of developing this statement can often go a long way toward establishing a common vision and a community within your unit. The process, therefore, requires extensive faculty input, and it must include a review of all relevant institutional, school, college, and departmental statements. While some departments already have clear missions and priority statements, most do not. In many instances, it is the process of articulating their faculty reward systems that places the need for a clear goal statement on the agenda of the unit. The departmental statement, when complete, must support the priorities of the institution, it must be as specific as possible, and as part of the process, the writers must build on the statements and guidelines developed by the related disciplinary and accrediting association. Those involved must also remember that developing such a document is a political process, and that everyone in the unit as well as those to whom the department reports must feel that they have had an opportunity to provide input and feedback. This documents the primary vehicle for communicating the priorities of your discipline to others at your institution.

PROMOTING DISCUSSION

Dialogue and debate are key elements in the process of developing promotion and tenure policies and guidelines. It is here where the unique issues of the institution will be addressed in the context of its history and culture. Active involvement not only helps ensure that the final recommendations will be accepted by the academic community, but also that key issues and concerns of faculty and administration are openly addressed. The following are examples of concerns raised and questions asked by faculty and chairs at several institutions as they participated in the process.

*Quality teaching is given lip service by the administration. The reward system is so biased that any time put into teaching is wasted. Quite frankly, if a baboon could publish two or three papers a year, it would be given tenure and a large salary, while a top-notch instructor with limited research would be denied tenure.*

*I have never heard anyone at . . . define teaching. For people here—faculty and students—the task is learning, not teaching, because we question every opinion and inference. Nobody measures learning.*
There are serious problems in evaluating individual contributions in collaborative research projects. Yet the most significant teaching and research projects tend to be collaborative in many disciplines. Our annual review and tenure/promotion system is not well designed to deal with collaborative work. Solving this requires better and different documentation methods than we now use (although there were no specific suggestions on how to improve current documentation).

How can we make it easier for persons to work across discipline boundaries or on “unusual” activities valued by the institution? Disciplines tend to be very narrow in what they value, perhaps even xenophobic. This makes it difficult for faculty to contribute to the university mission through work that is unusual or crosses discipline boundaries unless the discipline itself values activity.

Who is the “jury” for evaluating unusual contributions? If not the department, which tends to take a narrow view in most cases, then who? How can conflicting views be reconciled?

The six-year time frame for tenure is arbitrary. Why not have a longer period?

In some disciplines, very long-term research projects tend to have the most significant impacts. For example, significant publications may not occur until the end of long-term projects. Yet the annual review and even the tenure systems are biased against participation in such long projects.

How are various activities going to be weighted?

How much credibility will department guidelines be given at the dean’s level and at the provost’s level?

It would be helpful to have examples of a faculty portfolio under the new guidelines. What would be included in the portfolio?

What do we mean by community outreach? What is uniquely community outreach that does not overlap with research or teaching?
The examples in the document are vague and abstract. Need something real like an open-ended listing of possible service options.

When the draft suggests that involvement in governance is not a valued activity, then why would faculty get involved?

Faculty have some concerns that a portfolio will not be accepted at other institutions and will limit job opportunities at other institutions.

While some concerns will be more fundamental than others, it is essential that the faculty have ample opportunity to raise them during the developmental process and that each is addressed. Without open discussion during the writing process, there will be a better-than-ever chance that any statement, no matter how good it is, will be voted down at the departmental level.

WHAT TO INCLUDE

EXAMPLE: MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE, 1997

During the summer 1997 meeting at the Minnowbrook Conference Center of Syracuse University, a second group of participants addressed the department statement on promotion and tenure. Focusing on the process, the role of the document, and its contacts, the participants made a number of observations and recommendations. The following material is based on their report (a list of task force members is found at the end of this chapter).

Developing the Departmental Statement

To ensure the development of a fair and appropriate reward system, a number of recommendations are made:

1) First and foremost, each department needs to develop a statement of faculty performance expectations for promotion, tenure, and salary increases (or other forms of reward and recognition, if they exist). This departmental statement needs to be compatible with institution-wide expectations and must reflect the mission of the institution, but in addition, it should contain such department-specific information as:

   a) Normative statements about faculty work emanating from the major disciplinary associations to which department faculty belong
b) The uniqueness of any aspect of the department’s mission or priorities for action that may explain nontraditional faculty career patterns in that unit

c) The weight given to faculty performance for personnel decisions for faculty at different stages of their careers

d) The kinds of evidence or documentation which faculty are required (or allowed) to submit for evaluation

e) The criteria for “early” promotion or tenure, where these are possible

2) The development of departmental performance expectations documents must involve the unit faculty as a whole so that consensus can be built and faculty feel ownership of the document. This is especially important in large departments where faculty careers may take different shapes. There needs to be consensus about:

a) The kinds of work that are appropriate for faculty in this discipline

b) The kinds of acceptable evidence to document that work

c) The differences in performance expectations (if any) for faculty at different academic ranks

d) The kinds of professional, community, or institutional service which are rewarded in this department.

3) The departmental document must be acceptable to the dean and chief academic officer of the institution, as well as to any oversight committee that makes recommendations regarding priorities and rewards to the dean or chief academic officer. Until the document has been approved—in writing—by senior administrators, it cannot be used to assess the performance of department faculty. The chair’s role in this process is to explain and justify any controversial or unusual facets of the department document so as to make them acceptable to superiors.

4) As noted, the departmental (as well as institutional) expectations for faculty performance should be shared with candidates for positions, should be thoroughly discussed with any new (or newly hired) faculty, and should be reviewed by the entire department on a regular basis.

5) The documents required of candidates must be clearly specified and should include a personal narrative or reflective essay describing what is included, why it is included, and the scholarly, professional, and creative priorities of the candidate.

6) This statement should also include sections that address annual peer review, mid-term evaluation, and feedback. Included in the guidelines should be statements regarding departmental policies on workload, probation, timing, and the criteria that will be used annually and at other key times in a faculty member’s career—both three-year and post-tenure reviews—and so on. The statement will also describe what a faculty member is responsible for in the tenure and review process, and when and if a mentoring system is
available. The departmental statement should also address the issue of how teaching effectiveness will be determined and in many instances may identify helpful resources available to faculty who are up for review or who are serving on promotion and tenure committees.

7) The document should describe the criteria that will be used to determine scholarly, professional, and creative work.

8) The document should also describe how special assignments (requiring extensive time away from traditional scholarly, professional, and creative work) will be taken into account and documented.

9) The statement should suggest and elaborate on a menu of options for peer review of teaching, including user surveys, naturally occurring groups, pedagogical colloquia, course portfolios, oral portfolios, teaching portfolios, classroom visitations, external and internal reviewers of teaching materials, reflective essays, and videotaping.

10) It is suggested that the focus be on a selected professional portfolio where the number of items are limited, allowing for an in-depth review of what is included.

11) Finally, it is extremely important that the chair and the department promotion and tenure committee render all personnel judgments based on these written documents. Only in this way can claims of favoritism, partiality, subjectivity, etc., be obviated.

Each department’s statement will be based on the discipline(s) involved, the size of the institution, the size of the department, and the structure of the unit. While each department’s statement will be different, they all will need to address a number of common issues. It will be up to the unit to determine how scholarship, professional, and creative work can be described and documented; to determine what the specific mission of the unit and its priorities are; and how the entire process of review will take place at the department level. The document that is produced, if it is done well, will also guide the candidate in the preparation of his or her documentation and establish for all those involved in the review process the criteria that they should use. It will be one goal of those who write the document to ensure that the guidelines of the school, college, and institution are followed and supported. A list of those factors that the writer(s) of this departmental statement should consider can be found in Figure 1.
Figure 1

Departmental Statement on Promotion and Tenure

Checklist of Elements to Include*

☐ 1) Departmental mission and priority statement, with rationale
☐ 2) Research priorities of the department
☐ 3) Procedures, timelines, and eligibility for promotions and tenure
☐ 4) Range of activities that qualify as scholarly, professional, or creative, and under what conditions
☐ 5) Articulation with institutional and school/college statements
☐ 6) Promotion and tenure criteria. Differential weights for different activities (i.e., teaching, community service, etc.)
☐ 7) Guidelines and policies for documentation (scholarly, professional, and creative work, teaching, and service). How much should be included?
☐ 8) Description of the appeals process
☐ 9) How committees are structured and selected
☐ 10) Recruiting: How are positions advertised, interviews conducted, and appointments made to support the mission and priorities of the unit?
☐ 11) Mentoring: What system is in place to support new faculty?
☐ 12) Faculty support: What resources are available to support faculty?
☐ 13) Merit salary guidelines and criteria: What is the relative importance given to teaching, community, and institutional service?
☐ 14) Special assignments: How special assignments that involve extensive time will be taken into account—under what conditions can the tenure clock be stopped?

*Some topics may be school/college guidelines or union contracts to be referenced.

FACULTY HIRING PRACTICES

Dissemination of the statement should also be an integral part of the interview process. All prospective faculty should be given copies of the policy, and since it includes a statement of departmental priorities and practices, it should be discussed with each candidate with respect to his or her individual strengths and the assignment they would be given. In some instances, this would involve a formal commitment, in the form of an appointment letter as to which of their activities would be viewed as scholarly/professional for promotion and tenure considerations. These conversations during the hiring process can also lead to commitments of resources and to individual assignments. As Tierney and Bensimon (1996) have pointed out, the focusing on the promotion and tenure policies during the interview process can be a major early stage in introducing future faculty into the culture and priorities of the department.
RESOURCES

As you develop your departmental statement, there are a number of resources that you should review as part of the process.

STATEMENTS FROM YOUR DISCIPLINE

One of the most common problems facing faculty coming up for promotion and tenure review is that their materials will be reviewed by faculty from other fields who may have a different definition of scholarly work. A quality departmental statement that specifically defines scholarly, professional, and creative work in your field will help to avoid this problem. As part of a major national project at Syracuse University, more than 20 national associations have been actively involved in developing statements that describe the work of faculty in their fields and discuss the conditions under which the discipline believes this work should be appropriate for their promotion decisions.

These statements have been designed to assist departments and individual faculty by being descriptive rather than prescriptive, allowing each unit to determine, based on its own priorities, which specific faculty activities are appropriate for its use.

Statements have been completed or are nearing completion by the following associations and disciplines:

- American Academy of Religion
- American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
- American Association of Colleges of Nursing
- American Chemical Society
- American Education Research Association
- American Historical Association
- American Library Association/American Council of Research Libraries
- American Physical Society
- American Psychological Association/The Society for the Teaching of Psychology
- American Society of Civil Engineers
- Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
According to the associations, each field has significant areas of discipline-related faculty work that should be, but have not been, recognized in the faculty reward system. Consulting and building on these statements can add strength to your department statement.

**PROCEDURE GUIDES**

Two publications have been developed specifically to assist in the implementation of a quality promotion and tenure process. In both cases, there is an emphasis on using the various documents and guidelines that have been produced, with particular emphasis on the department guidelines: Having the statement is one thing; making sure it is being used and followed is another.


Another small book that you might find useful is


In it you will find a number of excellent suggestions on how to build community through the recruitment, hiring, and mentoring processes, with special attention given to the promotion and tenure system.

**SAMPLE DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES**

Departmental guidelines tend to range from short, six- to eight-page documents to more comprehensive documents of 20 pages or more. The key to length tends to be less a factor of who is writing it than what is being asked for by the dean and what is contained in the school, college, and institutional documents. For example, if the other statements describe in detail what is to be included in an evaluation of teaching effectiveness or what criteria will be used for promotion from one grade to another, this information can be referred to but not necessarily included in the departmental statement. However, in most instances, the information provided tends to be very carefully worded with an attempt to provide as much detail as possible and to leave as little as possible open to different interpretations.

The following excerpts have been selected to show how different departments have addressed three of the key issues.
1) RELATIONSHIPS OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE SYSTEM TO THE VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

EXAMPLE: IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

The College of Engineering aspires to prepare engineers of the 21st century by using innovative teaching methods and modern education technology to provide students with the following traits and abilities:

- Broad-based and fundamentally sound technical education
- Responsiveness to social, economic, political, and environmental issues
- Capability for career-long learning
- Appreciation of good teamwork for problem solving
- Command of effective communication skills
- High standards for professional behavior through adherence to principles of ethical conduct

The college strives to enhance its research with emphases on curiosity-driven basic research, task-oriented applied research, and both disciplinary and multidisciplinary activities. Multidisciplinary research areas where the college already has considerable strengths include:

- Computational methods
- Controls and instrumentation
- Energy engineering
- Engineered quality and reliability
- Engineering materials
- Environmental quality
- Manufacturing systems

Based on faculty interest, resource availability, and the outlook for future engineering and technology development, the college intends to focus its multidisciplinary research and graduate program...
development on, and to achieve national prominence in, four of these areas: materials, quality and reliability, environment, and energy.

As a land-grant university’s engineering college, we have an important service mission through outreach and extension efforts. The college envisions delivering this service to the following groups:

- Professional groups and industry, through continuing education and technology transfer activities
- Nontraditional students, by offering credit courses at suitable hours on campus and off campus using modern communication technologies
- K–12 students, to nurture their interest in science and technology, and citizens of the state, to enhance their awareness of modern engineering technology

The college strives to build upon its existing strengths, achieve excellence in fulfilling the land-grant university missions, and arrive at national distinction through appropriate investment and resource development in selected disciplinary and multidisciplinary programs.

**EXAMPLE: HOPE COLLEGE, ARTS DIVISION**

In the context of Hope College’s educational mission, the departments of art, dance, music, and theater have three goals. First, they are committed to offering academic programs of recognized excellence.

Second, they are committed to offering courses strongly imbedded in the philosophy of the liberal arts. Third, they are committed to encouraging student reflection on how the arts inform and are informed by human values and faith.
EXAMPLE: UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND POLICY

The Master’s in Health Administration Program has the following goals and objectives in response to its stated mission:

Teaching Goal and Objectives

**Goal.** To provide health management generalist education primarily for individuals with health service experience currently working in the field that will enable them to enhance their concepts, knowledge, and skills.

**Objectives.** With this goal as the guiding concept, the program will have as its main objectives the development of the following student competencies:

- Demonstration of an understanding of the distinctive characteristics of health service organizations
- Demonstration of an understanding of a systems approach to health management
- Demonstration of an ability to apply analytical tools

Research and Scholarship Goal, Objectives, and Approach to Measurement

**Goal.** To contribute to the knowledge base in the field of health management and policy by refining existing knowledge or developing new knowledge.

**Objectives.** With the above goal as a guiding concept, the program has the following objectives:

- To encourage each faculty member to be engaged in one or more scholarly projects associated with health management and policy
- As a program, to contribute to the literature in the field of health management and policy

**Measurement.** Identification, classification, and assessment of faculty scholarly contributions to the field via information contained in their annual reports.
Service Goal, Objectives, and Approach to Measurement

Goal. To provide technical assistance and professional service to representatives of the health care system and to the university.

Objectives. With the above goal as the guiding concept, the program has the following related service objectives:

- Through faculty leadership, participation, and contributions, assist professional health service associations and organizations, including state agencies, in their operations
- Through faculty leadership, participation, and contributions, provide health management and policy practitioners with information and knowledge
- Through faculty leadership, participation, and contributions, assist the university, school, and department in their operations

Measurement. Identification, classification, and assessment of faculty service activities via information contained in their annual reports.

EXAMPLE: MONMOUTH COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

Social Work Program Objectives

1) The primary objective of the social work program is the preparation of students for entry-level social work practice

2) To prepare students for graduate-level social work education

3) To contribute to the education of students from all parts of the college

4) To prepare social work majors to understand and appreciate human diversity as it exists in society

5) To prepare students for the internalization of the values and ethics of the social work profession
Relationship of program objectives to institutional mission. The objectives of the social work program are consistent with the mission of the college and its academic and operational goals. The social work objectives relate directly in the following areas:

1) We will offer a broad range of degree programs of high quality.

2) We will strengthen degree offerings by maintaining accreditation.

3) We will seek to build a more diverse student body by enrolling larger numbers from various ethnic minorities.

4) We will ensure that each professional program addresses human and social values, so that professionals will be prepared to understand the human dimensions of current and future problems.

5) We will provide an effective program which fosters student initiative, self-government, and citizenship in a multicultural community.

6) We will enlarge the spirit of cooperation and involvement between Monmouth College and our surrounding communities.

7) We will maintain the excellence of the faculty who teach in professional programs by requiring appropriate credentials, providing for professional development, and supporting interaction with professionals in the field.

2) SCHOLARSHIP IN THE DISCIPLINE

EXAMPLE: OTTERBEIN COLLEGE, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

The English department recognizes the importance and existence of scholarship in the many contributions made by faculty to their fields of expertise and interest, to their students and fellow teachers, and to their college. We take scholarship to be a fundament of a thriving liberal arts college faculty. By scholarship, we mean the kind of intellectual work whose primary, intended outcome can be found in any of three categories. We thus understand scholarship to designate an inclusive term involving a broad range of intellectual activity with multiple outcomes, rather than confining it merely to a single outcome (as has historically been the case). In articulating the variety of enterprises that
comprise the three outcome categories, we have used Ernest Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered*, as well as other readings, such as the recent statement on scholarship by the Modern Language Association (MLA). The categories pertaining to outcome are as follows:

1) **The presentation of one’s scholarly or creative ideas in a traditional public form which involves peer review. This includes:**

   **Scholarship of creative enterprise**
   - Creative work in the arts: poetry, fiction, drama, nonfiction
   - Interdisciplinary creative work that collaborates with the performing and visual arts

   **Scholarship of critical enterprise**
   - Articles in academic journals; presentations at conferences; academic books; book reviews; keynote speeches at conferences; scholarly bibliographies
   - Editing collections of articles or primary works; translating works of literature or academic works
   - Interdisciplinary research and presentations, projects, or publications to academic audiences
   - Grant writing that is peer judged outside of one’s institution, related to disciplinary or interdisciplinary projects
   - Academic reports (e.g., on archival projects or electronic projects)
   - Presenting a field in its interconnectedness with other fields or in its connections with social, moral, etc., issues (possibly an outgrowth of integrative studies work)
   - Consulting work based on one’s disciplinary expertise

2) **The development and effective teaching of courses**

   **Scholarship of pedagogical enterprise**
   - Creating workshops on teaching for teachers (on or off campus)
• Developing, teaching, and presenting a new course to a professional audience (including the research needed to increase one’s understanding of a particular subject, author, topic, etc.—also including research into teaching methods, etc.)

• Developing, teaching, assessing, and presenting an interdisciplinary course to an audience of peers

• Developing, assessing, and presenting an interdisciplinary program to an audience of peers

• Articles or books on pedagogy

• Textbooks or manuals for teachers

• Grant writing that is peer judged outside of one’s institution and related to research and teaching

3) The contribution of service to the college and external communities

Scholarship of engagement

• Connecting humanities’ scholarship to public needs, locally, nationally, or globally, in team projects, oral presentations, or publications

• Writing or presenting research for a nonacademic audience about areas within one’s academic expertise

• Working as a consultant in the community (involving research and production of documents); e.g., dramaturgy

• Creating and assessing a new academic program (to the extent that this involves professional expertise and research; e.g., into similar programs, studies done about relevant issues, etc.)

We take these outcomes—presentation of ideas, teaching, and service—not to represent a hierarchy; instead, we recognize the value, importance, and vital necessity of all three. Thus, over the course of a career at Otterbein, faculty in this department are expected to engage in scholarly activity
within the outcomes articulated in the aforementioned categories, both inside and outside the college. Faculty are expected to conduct scholarship in one or more of the areas of expertise for which they were hired. Because our department bears significant responsibility for the integrative studies program, we would also expect to see faculty research emerging in relationship to that program.

3) PROCEDURES

EXAMPLE: SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Procedure for Annual Performance Review of Nontenured Faculty

- Each nontenured faculty is reviewed annually by a four- or five-person committee of tenured members of the department. This committee is designated the “mentor committee.”

- The department chair appoints the mentor committee during the first semester of a nontenured faculty member’s service. Whenever possible, the mentor committee includes both faculty whose teaching and research interests are similar to those of the nontenured faculty member and others whose teaching and research interest are in other areas. To the extent possible, continuity of membership on the mentor committee is maintained until tenure review is completed.

- The mentor committee provides counsel to the nontenured faculty member with regard to teaching and advising, research, and other job-related matters.

- The mentor committee prepares, each spring, a written evaluation of the nontenured faculty member’s performance. The annual evaluations are based on evidence about teaching and advising, research, and (where applicable) service. Such evidence may include, in addition to that submitted by the nontenured faculty member, information collected by the mentor committee from interviews with students about a faculty member’s teaching and advising, assessment of scholarship submitted by outside evaluators, etc. The written evaluation includes, where appropriate, suggestions for improvements in teaching, research, or service, as well as the committee’s overall assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

- The mentor committee discusses its written evaluation with the nontenured faculty member (who receives a copy of the evaluation) in a meeting also attended by the
department chair. Since university procedures require that a department chair submit evaluative comments as part of the annual review of a nontenured faculty member, the department chair will either associate him/herself fully with the mentor committee’s report or submit a separate statement of evaluation.

- If the nontenured faculty member objects to any aspect of the evaluation prepared by the mentor committee and/or the department chair, he or she may submit a written statement that describes the basis for those objections.

- The mentor committee’s report, the department chair’s report, and any statement furnished by the nontenured faculty member are submitted by the department chair to the dean and the vice chancellor according to standard university procedures.

**Procedure for Reappointment of Nontenured Faculty**

- During the semester in which a contract renewal decision is required, the nontenured faculty member’s mentor committee will conduct a “mini-tenure review” and prepare a written report that includes a recommendation regarding the contract renewal decision.

- In evaluating the teaching record of a candidate for contract renewal, the mentor committee will examine course evaluations as well as information made available by the candidate. The mentor committee may also meet with the candidate’s current or former students, observe his or her classes, and solicit written evaluations from former students.

- In evaluating the research and scholarship record of a candidate for contract renewal, the mentor committee will read and evaluate all manuscripts and publications produced by the faculty member. The mentor committee may also seek evaluations of the candidate’s research from external specialists.

- After reviewing the faculty member’s teaching and research record, the mentor committee prepares the report.

- The mentor committee discusses its written evaluation and recommendation with the candidate for contract renewal (who receives a copy of the evaluation and recommendation) in a meeting also attended by the department chair.
• If the candidate for contract renewal objects to any aspect of the evaluation and recommendation, he or she may submit a written statement that describes the basis for those objections.

• The mentor committee’s report and recommendation, along with any statement of objection furnished by the candidate for renewal, are furnished to all tenure-track members of the faculty in advance of a meeting of the faculty.

• At the meeting, tenure-track faculty will discuss the report and recommendation (and any statement submitted by the candidate). The department’s tenured faculty will vote on both.

• The results of the faculty vote, along with the mentor committee’s report and any statement furnished by the candidate, will be submitted by the department chair to the dean and the vice chancellor according to standard university procedures.

**EXAMPLE: UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES**

**Research/Scholarship**

As a part of its mission, the department of communication studies supports research, including scholarly creative activities, that advance knowledge, bolster classroom instruction, and promote the application of knowledge for the benefit of society. Consequently, faculty members in the department are expected to engage actively in a program of communication research and scholarship. The department recognizes that for a faculty member to be recommended for tenure and to reflect his or her continuing growth, he/she must be engaged in a significant program of communication research and scholarship of sufficient quality and quantity to ensure that the faculty member is committed to the scholarly development of the discipline. The faculty member’s program of research and scholarship should be ongoing throughout the probationary period.

Generally speaking, scholars in the department of communication studies engage in scholarship that leads to publication either in traditional publication outlets of the discipline or in presentation before professionals within the discipline. The department places the highest premium on peer-reviewed published research. The department also understands that creative presentation constitutes scholarship. To help assess the scholarly quality of the work, creative presentations require critical assessment by fellow professionals which addresses the level and quality of this scholarship. A faculty member cannot rely entirely on creative presentations and/or scholarly paper presentations for the awarding of tenure.
It is expected that a substantial portion of the faculty member’s program of research and scholarship will be published and presented at a national or international level to scholars in the field of communication. A greater value will be assigned to single and first-authored research and scholarship. Significant collaborative research also is valued. Generally, the value assigned to items of research and scholarship will be determined by dissemination:

- Greatest weight will be given to national and international levels.
- Moderate weight will be given to regional and specialized levels.
- Least weight will be given to the state level.

A faculty member is expected to provide documentation that he/she is engaged in a significant program of research and scholarship. The faculty member should be prepared to document the significance of each entry, such as rejection rate, editorial policy statement, editorial board, and evidence of peer review. Appropriate forms of documentation include:

- Scholarly books
- Peer-reviewed yearbook articles
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Peer-reviewed monographs
- Research-based textbooks
- Peer-reviewed and -invited performances and exhibitions
- Critical assessments of peer-reviewed and -invited performances and exhibitions
- Book reviews in communication journals
- Performance reviews in communication and performance journals
- Editorships of scholarly materials
- Memberships on editorial boards
- Ad hoc reviewer for journals
- Peer-reviewed and -invited presentations of scholarly papers at professional conventions and conferences
Refereeing/reviewing competitive convention papers and programs

- Critiquing creative presentations
- Critiquing scholarly/research presentations
- Panelist on special convention programs
- Grant proposals
- Abstracts
- Translations
- Bibliographies
- Works in professional and consumer publications that demonstrate high standards of professional practice
- Citations by other scholars

EXAMPLE: NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE

General Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

All faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of (1) scholarship, (2) teaching, (3) service to the department and university and, in the case of faculty in mathematics education, (4) activities in professional education. An accumulation of achievements in all of these areas will be considered, but a candidate whose performance in either areas (1) or (2) is unsatisfactory will not be recommended for promotion or tenure. Promotion will not normally be recommended until an individual has successfully served a minimum of six years in rank, at NIU and other institutions of higher education.

In greater detail, the criteria used in making these evaluations are as follows:

For promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and/or tenure.

1) Superior scholarship in the past and definite promise of continued excellence.

Evidence that the faculty member is in the process of achieving professional recognition among leaders in the individual’s discipline. Scholarship should emphasize the acquisition of new knowledge, but in the case of faculty in mathematics education, weight may be
given to the published dissemination of knowledge. Evidence of scholarly achievement and promise may include:

a) Publication of scholarly papers in recognized journals appropriate to the individual’s discipline

b) Publication of monographs and books reflecting an advanced level of scholarship

c) Postdoctoral fellowships and memberships in various institutes, during the academic year and the summer

d) Invitations to address colloquia or seminars at other universities

e) Active participation in discussions and seminars, both formal and informal

f) Recommendations of established scholars in the field

g) Participation in professional meetings and contributions of papers and abstracts; NSF and other postdoctoral research grants

h) Service as a referee for recognized journals

i) Service as a reviewer for papers in the mathematical sciences

2) Contributions to the propagation of the mathematical sciences. These may include:

a) Good teaching as recognized by students and colleagues

b) Development of new course materials

c) Design and/or implementation of new courses or curricula

d) Authorship of textbooks or lecture notes

e) Direction of dissertations or theses

f) Active participation in discussions, both formal and informal, concerning the teaching and development of course offerings in the mathematical sciences
g) Academic responsibilities undertaken as coordinator of a multisection course

h) Activities in other areas of education

3) Service to the department, university, and profession.

For early promotion or tenure.

In order for a candidate to qualify for early promotion or tenure, the candidate’s record of achievement must show clear evidence of a quality of scholarship that is extraordinary as compared to normal departmental standards. This extraordinary level of achievement should be reflected in letters of evaluation from prominent experts outside of the department.

1) Service. Faculty members in the department of mathematics must demonstrate a commitment to quality service to the department, the college, and the university. The department recognizes the merit of service to local, state, regional, national, and international constituencies. While service is expected of probationary faculty, it should not interfere with faculty members’ fulfilling research and teaching obligations.

Professional service activities (paid or unpaid) may include, but are not limited to, the areas that follow. Although this list is not exhaustive, additional service activities should be evaluated in light of whether the candidate serves by virtue of professional education and expertise in communication.

To the department, college, and university:

• Committees
• Task forces
• Councils
• Faculty senate
• Development programs
• Recruitment
• Special presentations
To the profession:

- Office in association
- Program planner
- Committee work
- Chairing programs
- Directing intercollegiate and secondary debate tournaments and performance festivals
- Judging/critiquing in intercollegiate and secondary debate tournaments and performance festivals

To other constituencies:

- Conducting workshops
- Delivering lectures
- Consulting in problem solving
- Consulting in training programs
- Producing applied trade/corporate publications
- Providing expert opinions

CONCLUSION

Each of these statements attempts to relate the nature of the discipline to the mission statements of the school, college, and institution. In most instances, the mission statements are placed at the beginning of the document. It will be up to the candidate to relate the contents of his or her professional portfolio directly to these priorities.

As noted earlier, departmental reviews of faculty are often viewed with skepticism by institutional committees, deans, and other senior administrators. This skepticism may be well founded; there are countless examples of promotion or tenure documents sent up from the department that, for academics or administrators from other disciplines, lack credibility. The documents may read like a
whitewash of the faculty member’s record of performance, glossing over gaps or shortcomings in an
effort to be “collegial.” Or the documents may extol a performance that, to outside eyes, seems ordinary.
There also have been cases in which the departmental documents seem overly critical or condemnatory
of a faculty member’s performance, leaving outsiders to wonder whether these reviews constitute some
kind of personal attack rather than a supposedly objective assessment of performance.

It is the responsibility of the chair and department committee to enhance the credibility of the
department’s promotion and tenure documents. It is only at the department level that the disciplinary
expertise exists to assess a faculty member’s performance as a teacher or scholar. Smaller departments
and some fields of study may need to go outside of the institution to get the level of specialization that
some reviews would require. It is important that the policy of the unit and institution include procedures
for this process.

The credibility of departmental documents will be enhanced if:

- The documents evaluate the faculty member’s performance in terms of the departmental
  and institutional expectations for faculty performance, or in light of other written
  statements which approve (or fail to approve) of a faculty member’s performance in
  nontraditional areas.

- The documents bolster their conclusions by citing expectations for faculty performance
  disseminated by the major disciplinary associations to which department faculty belong.

- The documents “bite the bullet” when it comes to making hard decisions about a
  colleague’s performance: They make it clear to readers that the department has taken the
  responsibility for monitoring and assessing the quality of its own members. When
  departments fail to exercise this responsibility, they invite outsiders, often with no
  expertise in the discipline, to usurp that role.

- The documents assess a faculty member’s contribution fairly and consistently; they are
  neither whitewashes of shoddy performance nor ad hominem attacks on an unpopular
  colleague. They make the case for their conclusions by dealing with and evaluating the
  quantitative and qualitative evidence.

The need to align, or realign, faculty roles and rewards at the department level, points to new,
exciting, and essential roles for the department chair. The chair is the person who achieves alignment
within the department for faculty roles and rewards, and the chair is the mediating agent between each
individual faculty member’s personal goals and the needs of the department: These are different
conceptions of the role of the department chair from those traditionally cited. At a time when higher education is being forced to rethink what we do and why and how we do it, it is fitting that department chairs rethink how they can be most effective as leaders whose actions, at least as much as those of anyone else in the institution, affect the quality of faculty careers, student life, and academic programs.
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